



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

our children the arts of peace, in the crafty ingenuity of our inventors, worthy of the Borgias and Torquemadas at their worst, in the devotion of noble young men to long careers of destruction? And it may at least be said of common murderers that they pay their own expenses and buy their own weapons, but I, who abhor this whole bloody business, am forced to contribute to war after war, and my own money is applied to ends which I abominate and detest. No assassin has ever obliged me to supply funds for the furtherance of his designs, nor to affix hateful stamps adorned with pictures of his infernal engines to my bank cheques.

There is just one way to "stamp out" anarchy, and that is, to discourage violence in all its forms. I know perfectly well that this cannot be done speedily. We all have much of the savage in us, and it will be the task of generations to extricate ourselves completely. But the direction of our efforts should be clear. We must push in the direction of less violence. We must have smaller navies, fewer soldiers, more arbitration. We must rid ourselves of the superstition that we can, as individuals, throw the blame on the state for the evil which we do in its name. Lowell punctured this theory long ago.

"Ef you take a sword and dror it,
An' go stick a feller thru,
Guv'ment ain't to answer for it,
God'll send the bill to you."

If, instead of seeking to put down in ourselves and in our nation the spirit of violence, we encourage it, and strive to increase it, we are bent towards anarchy, and our tears over the bier of the President are crocodile's tears. It is conceivable that many red-handed lynchers in the South were horrified at the assassination,—men who, when they could not find the "nigger" they wanted, burned "any old nigger" that came along. We may well question their right to take exception to any crime, however terrible. But are we, who make war one of the chief ends of the state, who set up a department of anarchy and are prouder of it than of any other of our industries,—are we in a much better plight? Let us be honest: we are not. If we intend to advance farther along the path of licensed dynamite, let us frankly admit that at heart we are anarchists, and let us call our next torpedo boat the "Czolgosz" and our next battleship the "Anarchy," and the next one thereafter the "Hell." There will be no doubt then about the anarchic character of our designs.

RHINEBECK, N. Y.

The Attitude of Christians as to Peace and War.*

BY DR. JESSE H. HOLMES.

Christianity met with a great disaster early in its career—a disaster largely made possible by its rapid spread—in that it came to be officially recognized as a state religion. In its inception Christianity was particularly marked by its strong appeal to the individual. We cannot in our day fully grasp the originality displayed by its founders in turning their backs

upon gods who dealt with mankind by the wholesale, as races or nations, and turning to God who speaks to the individual soul, and for whom not the nation, but the man, is the unit. Such conception is not, of course, a new one as presented by Jesus and his followers; it was present in the minds of many of the prophets, and was not unknown among ancient philosophies.

HOW THE GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM MADE ITS WAY.

But such idea of God was fundamental in Christianity. It was not to Jews, not to Gentiles, not to rich or poor, not to great or small, but to individual men that was preached the gospel of the kingdom within us. For three centuries it made its way amid persecution and against opposition, passing on from soul to soul, uplifting the slave and humbling the master, illuminating the wrecks of old philosophies, and bringing back to life a zest and interest which it had in large measure lost. In those three centuries it had honeycombed the Empire. Slave had whispered the gospel to his fellow-slave, or perhaps timidly to a kindly master. It circulated in the arteries of trade, it was talked in the streets, it grew even when hunted into the catacombs. In all this it was taught only as man to man. It was backed by no great official power, but represented in all that it accomplished its own native force and energy. Where it won its way it was by mastering the consciences of men. It had no prizes to offer by which to tempt the time-server. Only a fervent conviction of truth, only a deadly (or, rather, a truly living) earnestness could induce men to ally themselves with a proscribed sect. We may hardly doubt that the Christian Church of this time was made up of real Christians; they had stood the test of fire, and with only a natural human alloy of baser metal, they had been proved sterling metal.

It was under such circumstances that disaster fell upon it, in the form of an un hoped-for and dazzling success—the Empire became officially Christian. The old and well-worn temptation rejected by Jesus himself was now offered to his Church, and it fell. "All the kingdoms of the earth will I give thee" might have been the language of Constantine when he made the Roman empire Christian in name. And what great things might not the Church of the Christ do with all the kingdoms of the earth? The vision of a new heaven and a new earth so dazzled the bishops of the fourth century that they forgot to notice the small and apparently insignificant condition annexed, "If thou wilt fall down and worship me." Not for the first time was a distinctive price unnoticed in the glory of immediate possession. Christianity received the kingdoms of the earth, and fell down before Satan.

A NOMINAL, OFFICIAL CHRISTIANITY.

Thenceforth there were princes in the household of Him who was "meek and lowly"; thenceforth Christianity went forth, sword in hand, to conquer heathendom, not for the Christ-spirit, but for a nominal Christianity. The Church turned from men to man. It baptized nations, indeed, after it had conquered them,—baptizing with water, and, indeed, with fire also,—but neglecting the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Only incidentally, and in small measure, did it spread abroad the spirit of the Master.

* This paper was read at the American Friends Peace Conference in Philadelphia, December 12.

Those methods which had made Christianity so great a power that the Empire was forced to adopt its name were neglected for those which had produced the very weakness under which the Empire suffered. The Church chose the way of the devil to reach the ends of God, taking no warning, as they might for the very ease of the journey, that they had left the straight and narrow for the broad and easy way.

Christianity broke up into warring sects. It dealt with principalities and powers; its eye became keen for estates, and it dealt in souls mainly by wholesale. Almost every generation, indeed, has seen small groups of individuals breaking away from the evil of official religion, and striving for a return to the spirit of Christianity — to a direct walk with God, a direct communing with his self-revealings. But, seeing the supreme success of the Master's failure, the crown of martyrdom is no longer offered beyond a certain point. So soon as Christianity becomes strong enough to be dangerous the kingdoms of the earth are offered again, and still this bait is taken. Protestantism, Calvinism, Puritanism, have in turn denied God in spirit while defining and explaining him in words.

I would not be understood as indicating that Christianity has been altogether lost, altogether a failure — so far from it that it has always been and is to-day the leaven of human life. Its representatives have been, and are, few and weak in worldly power, but they have been, and are, the hope of the world. And the long look over the centuries since Christianity was Romanized by a pretence of Christianizing Rome does not tend to discouragement. More and more, century by century, men have caught at God's personal fatherhood and man's brotherhood as the great facts of the divine message — at love as the fulfilling of the law. "Not by might or by power, but by my Spirit" is now more than ever a triumphant note.

INDIVIDUALS RESPONSIBLE TO GOD ALONE.

I wish to use this opportunity to make a distinct plea for the individual — the separate person — as the indivisible and indestructible unit in all matters of righteousness; that we shall undo the wrong of centuries and stand responsible to God alone. Christian churches and Christian nations are made of Christian men — are nothing apart from them or in addition to them. The whole is not greater than the sum of its parts. Nothing is right for us as Quakers, as Christians, as citizens, which is wrong for us as individuals. There is no mysterious entity to be called a nation or a church which may cancel our duties as sons of God, and substitute another standard of right and wrong. If individuals making up a church represent a spirit of force, of violence, the church cannot represent a spirit of peace and goodwill. If missionaries are backed by gunboats, if they collect indemnities under threat of the bayonet, they are missionaries of that power which promised the kingdoms of earth in order secretly to destroy the kingdom of heaven. If citizens go forth to slay and destroy, they may carry the name of civilization on their lips, but they are simply homicides and barbarians.

Men salve their consciences, yea, even benumb their consciences, by shifting the responsibilities of their deeds to a mythical something called a government, a church;

but no power can release a man from the burden of his deeds. Not that all homicide and destruction is alike evil; not that men may not deceive themselves so that the worse appears the better. But this is only possible by avoiding the Christian attitude and shirking the Christian responsibility. I do not even say that all homicide and destruction are necessarily culpable; but only that what is wrong for each of us as a man cannot be right for each of us as a citizen, as a Christian. The righteous laws of nations are superadded to the moral law, not substituted for it. All our duties as members of churches, as citizens of nations, are based upon our duties as members of the human family, and stand for those higher duties consequent upon closer relations. They can never release us from the fundamental duty of a sense of universal brotherhood. We can no more, without violation of Christian principle, build our gain, our greatness, our exaltation, upon the loss of the Hindoo or the Hottentot, the Spaniard or the Filipino, than upon that of our fellow-Quaker or our fellow-American. And it is a neglect of this principle fundamental in Christianity, it is this placing metes and bounds upon our Christian charity, that marks the barbarizing of Christianity during sixteen centuries. Some phases of this essential falsehood are these:

1. That Christianity is for peace, indeed, but that because of human weakness Christians must excuse war.

2. That peace tends to make cowards of us, and that we must have war in order to support the virility of the race.

3. That while violence for selfish ends is wrong, it is lawful to do evil that good may come.

4. That experience shows that many evils could not have been overcome without war.

(1.) Christianity, it is said, is for peace among men, but must defer to the weakness of humanity. Christianity must indeed stoop to the weakness of humanity, not to excuse that weakness, but to cure it. We must pardon the sinner; must we also accept the sin? Jesus, indeed, refused to punish the sinner; did he at the same time make light of the sin? Shall Christianity trail its white robe in the mire of sin to show its fellowship with sinners? Shall it do evil that it may draw near to evil-doers? Not so do I understand the teaching of the Master or the teaching of the Spirit. The Christian is not called upon to be stupid, selfish and sinful in order to reach those who are immersed in stupidity, selfishness and sin. Such doctrine could never have obtained except for the pagan idea that we are fractional parts of a nation or of a church, and must therefore assimilate ourselves to its average quality.

THE CHRISTIAN A PARTNER WITH GOD.

But the Christian attitude is that of an independent unit, a partner with God in the work of subduing his earth. His duty to God transcends all temporary human relations; and, indeed, the conclusion at its best is a reversal of common sense. Because men are weak, let us be strong; because they are ignorant and violent, let us be wise and gentle. If they exalt force, let us show them how much more powerful is love. Of course, if our plea is that we are too weak to stand against the crowd, or that we believe the voice of the mob is the

voice of God and to be obeyed—that is frankly an avowal of disbelief in Christianity, and should serve as an appeal to those who are Christians to convert us.

(2.) Does peace make cowards of us? If it does, then Christian teaching is falsehood, and we should turn to a new and true gospel. It is the worst of hypocrisy to proclaim a gospel of peace as a theory and a gospel of war as a practice. And this is largely the attitude of a nominal Christianity to-day. Numerous pseudo-Christian ministers have exalted the value of war as necessary to make men brave and self-sacrificing. In other words, they do not believe that the gospel they preach *ex-officio* tends to produce brave, true men. Occasional wars are necessary to serve as an antidote to the effects of periods in which Christian practices prevail. If for years we have been at peace—the condition longed for by prophet and Messiah—therefore, lest our manhood decline, let us burn cities; let us starve women and children, and kill men by thousands to avert the degeneration due to peace and the preaching of peace. Either Christianity is a mistake and a failure, and should be given up wholly or in part, or it is true and right, and should be applied in times of difficulty and danger as well as in times of ease and comfort. Indeed, unless it is a total failure, Christianity is needed especially at times when men differ and when passion tends to take the place of reason.

HEROISM OF PEACE.

But does peace make cowards of us? Let us turn first to war itself for answer. Peace made the men called heroes by the newspapers, who made up our armies in the Spanish war. Practically, all of them were born, educated and matured in a period of profound peace. But the courage of a soldier is not a very high type of courage. He is drilled beforehand, so that his own will shall have the smallest possible activity in the time of crisis. He risks being killed, indeed; but when did taking risks come to be a high type of courage? If it is so truly, then the gambler is somewhat of a hero too. I am not arguing against the courage of the American. I fully believe in his courage; but the taking of risks, even heavy risks, is not the best evidence of it. It is the motive, not the danger, that shows a hero. We have vastly better evidence in the heroes of peace, who never fail to appear in accidents, in wrecks at sea, in fires on land. These are they who take risks, often far greater than those of the soldier, to save life, not to destroy it. We have greater heroes than those of war, again, in those who face unflinchingly long years of monotonous labor, giving their strength ungrudgingly to win comfort and happiness for their families. We have heroes in our physicians, who so devote themselves to healing the sick and alleviating suffering that they deny themselves even the vacations which are their due. We have heroes in the pioneers who conquer the wilderness, in the explorers who expand the domain of human knowledge, in all those whose lives are self-dedicated to the good of others. We mistake deeply, we do injustice to our race, to our religion and to our civilization, when we grant our chief applause to the showy, organized national destroyers rather than to the unnoticed, miscellaneous saviors, who do their work, demanding no meed of praise, who never claim to be heroes, but who

support upon their bent shoulders the hope of the world. Glory to the builder, not to the destroyer.

(3.) But shall we not do evil that good may come? If good come on the whole, then what we do is not evil. It is in the consequences of an act that exists its quality, whether good or evil. If an act has no consequences, it has no moral element. But the flaw in the proposition that we may make war for a good purpose lies in its short view. The experience of the race and the teaching of our highest instincts unite in making clear that the

REAL RESULTS OF WAR ONLY EVIL.

total result of war is evil, and only evil continually. It is cheap and common to assert that war freed our nation from English domination, and that it struck the shackles from four millions of slaves. We leave out of account the heritage of bitterness and hatred not yet outlived that followed after the Revolution, to say nothing of the thousands of lives thrown away or made miserable. We skillfully avoid the question, which is a vital one, whether greater self-control, greater patience might not have accomplished more with less of evil. And we leave out of account the evident fact that the slavery question is not settled,—that, indeed, it is perhaps less soluble as a race question embittered by the brutal years of violence and by sectional discord than it was as a slavery question. Again, we fail to consider what self-restraint and patience might have done. And our fourth difficulty is involved in our third. War is sometimes necessary, it is said, for the sake of others. The strong must be violent to help the weak—or, as before, the end justifies the means. Even so, friends, if what we look upon were the end—but there is no end. In a wave of nationwide enthusiasm we went to war with Spain, where men were governed badly and against their will, and where starvation and torture were used to enforce submission. After a harvest of suffering, disease and crime had been reaped, we now look to a Cuba free from Spain, and we find ourselves immeshed in a war with a people whom we govern badly and against their will, and where starvation and torture are used to enforce submission. Good may, indeed, come in spite of evil, for of unmixed evil there are few examples in the affairs of men, but good does not come because of it. If so much good has come in spite of all the evil, what would not the world be if it could be brought to Christianity?

ATHEISM OF VIOLENCE.

There is no more fundamental atheism than is involved in a proclamation that God is too weak to win his way without calling in the devil to his help. There is no deeper infidelity than that which so distrusts the strength of righteousness that it must lean upon the arm of unrighteousness. It is from this attitude of apology that I would earnestly call Christians to-day. "Let us have faith that right makes might," and in that faith let us fair forward courageously in the path we are in. Let us no more evade and pretend. Are we ashamed of the Christ and his message? If not, let us speak it, and live it in spirit and in truth. May we not have, in clear, unmistakable tones, the outspoken, uncompromising demand for righteousness on the part of each individual before God; the selfless plea for self-conquest, for the ruling of our own spirits? May we not have a definite re-

jection of compromise with evil, of deals with iniquity, a courageous and confident stand upon the power of the spirit of love to solve the hard problems of the world?
Swarthmore College, Pennsylvania.

Text of the New Hay-Pauncefote Canal Treaty.

The United States of America and his Majesty Edward VII. of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and of the British dominions beyond the seas, King, and Emperor of India, being desirous to facilitate the construction of a ship canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific oceans by whatever route may be considered expedient, and to that end to remove any objection which may arise out of the Convention of the 19th of April, 1850, commonly called the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, to the construction of such canal under the auspices of the government of the United States, without impairing the general principles of neutralization established in Article 8 of that convention, have for that purpose appointed as their plenipotentiaries: the President of the United States, John Hay, Secretary of State of the United States of America, and his Majesty Edward VII. of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and of the British dominions beyond the seas, King, and Emperor of India, the Right Honorable Lord Pauncefote, G. C. B., G. C. M. G., his Majesty's ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the United States; who, having communicated to each other their full powers, which were found to be in due and proper form, have agreed upon the following articles:

ARTICLE I. The high contracting parties agree that the present treaty shall supersede the aforementioned Convention of the 19th of April, 1850.

ARTICLE II. It is agreed that the canal may be constructed under the auspices of the government of the United States, either directly, at its own cost, or by gift or loan of money to individuals or corporations, or through subscriptions to or purchase of stock or shares, and that, subject to the provisions of the present treaty, the said government shall have and enjoy all the rights incident to such construction, as well as the exclusive right of providing for the regulation and management of the canal.

ARTICLE III. The United States adopts as the basis of the neutralization of such ship canal the following rules substantially as embodied in the Convention of Constantinople, signed the 28th of October, 1888, for the free navigation of the Suez canal, that is to say:

1. The canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations observing these rules, on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any such nation, or its citizens or subjects, in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic or otherwise. Such conditions and charges of traffic shall be just and equitable.

2. The canal shall never be blockaded, nor shall any right of war be exercised nor any act of hostility be committed within it. The United States, however, shall be at liberty to maintain such military police along the canal as may be necessary to protect it against lawlessness and disorder.

3. Vessels of war of a belligerent shall not revictual

nor take any stores in the canal except so far as may be strictly necessary; and the transit of such vessels through the canal shall be effected with the least possible delay, in accordance with the regulations in force, and with only such intermission as may result from the necessities of the service. Prizes shall be in all respects subject to the same rules as vessels of war of the belligerents.

4. No belligerent shall embark or disembark troops, munitions of war, or warlike materials in the canal, except in case of accidental hindrance of the transit, and in such case the transit shall be resumed with all possible dispatch.

5. The provisions of this article shall apply to waters adjacent to the canal, within three marine miles of either end. Vessels of war of a belligerent shall not remain in such waters longer than twenty-four hours at any one time except in case of distress, and in such case shall depart as soon as possible; but a vessel of war of one belligerent shall not depart within twenty-four hours from the departure of a vessel of war of the other belligerent.

6. The plant, establishments, buildings and all works necessary to the construction, maintenance and operation of the canal shall be deemed to be parts thereof for the purposes of this treaty, and in time of war, as in time of peace, shall enjoy complete immunity from attack or injury by belligerents, and from acts calculated to impair their usefulness as part of the canal.

ARTICLE IV. It is agreed that no change of territorial sovereignty or of international relations of the country or countries traversed by the before-mentioned canal shall affect the general principles of neutralization or the obligations of the high contracting parties under the present treaty.

ARTICLE V. The present treaty shall be ratified by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, and by his Britannic majesty; and the ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington or at London at the earliest possible time within six months from the date hereof.

In faith whereof the respective plenipotentiaries have signed this treaty and hereunto affixed their seals.

Done in duplicate at Washington, the eighteenth day of November, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and one.

JOHN HAY, (Seal)
PAUNCEFOTE. (Seal)

New Books.

INTERNATIONAL LAW. By G. G. Wilson, Ph.D., and George F. Tucker, Ph.D. New York: Silver, Burdett & Co. Octavo. Cloth. 450 pages.

This work of 450 pages, by Dr. Wilson of Brown University and Dr. Tucker, formerly reporter of decisions of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, is intended only as an introduction to the study of international law, and will be found an excellent work for those just commencing the subject. It gives a brief review of the history and general scope of international law, and then takes up the subject of the "Persons in International Law," namely, states, and their relations one to another. In Part III. on the "International Law